



08/754,829

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/754,829	11/22/96	HANSEN	C 43876-83

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY
1850 K STREET NW STE 450
WASHINGTON DC 20006-2296

B3M1/0911

EXAMINER

SHAH, A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2302

4

DATE MAILED:

09/11/97

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 11/22/96 ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three (3) month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- ☒ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
- ☒ Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
- ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.
- ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
- ☐

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

- ☒ Claims 12-32 and 53-61 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claims 1-11, 33-52 and 62-70 have been cancelled.
- ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
- ☒ Claims 12-32 and 53-61 are rejected.
- ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
- ☐ This application has been filed with Informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
- ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
- ☒ The ~~submitted~~ drawings have been received on 11/22/96. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable ☒ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).
- ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
- ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- ☒ ~~Other~~ See attached office action

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit: 2302

15. Claims 12-32 and 53-61 are presented for examination.
16. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
17. Applicant is reminded of the provision of MEP. 608.02 (q) and (r) regarding a separate letter to the chief draftsman.
18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

20. Claims 12-32 and 53-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason (USPN: 5,268,855).

21. Mason et al. disclose a general purpose programmable media processor having a instruction path and a data path to digitally process a plurality of media data streams. The media

Art Unit: 2302

processor comprises a high bandwidth external interface operable to receive a plurality of data of various sizes from an external source and communicate the received data over the data path, at least one register file configurable to receive and store data from the data path and to communicate the stored data to the data path, and a multi-precision execution unit coupled to the data path. The multi-precision execution unit configurable to partition data received from the data path to account for the elemental symbol size of the plurality of media data streams, and programmable to operate on the data to generate a unified symbol output to the data path. [See abstract, fig. 1, column 2 (line 31) - column 3 (line 61), and column 4 (line 26) - column 6 (line 24)].

22. Mason did not explicitly give details about operating the media processor at substantially peak rate during the system operation. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Mason's system such that the media processor is operated at substantially peak rate during the system operation because it would have allowed the system to process the media information at much higher data rate based on the system requirements, thereby increasing the overall media information processing rate of the system and hence increase the overall performance of the system.

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nakagawa et al (PN: 5,426,600)

Daniel et al (PN: 5,201,056)

Art Unit: 2302


Freerksen (PN: 4,975,868)

Alsup et al (PN: 4,893,267).

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alpesh M. Shah whose telephone number is (703) 305-9698. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 7:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alyssa H. Bowler, can be reached on (703) 305-9702. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-5358.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


ALPESH M. SHAH
PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2300

A. Shah/kw